arXiv:1404.3790v1 [math.AC] 15 Apr 2014

n-COHERENCE AND (n, d)-PROPERTIES IN AMALGAMATED ALGEBRA ALONG AN IDEAL

KARIMA ALAOUI ISMAILI AND NAJIB MAHDOU

Abstract. Let $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism and let J be an ideal of B. The purpose of this article is to examine the transfer of the properties of n-coherence and strong n-coherence from a ring A to his amalgamated algebra $A \bowtie^f J$. Also, we investigate the (n, d)-property of the amalgamated algebra $A \bowtie^f J$, to resolve Costa's first conjecture.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, all rings are commutative with identity element, and all modules are unitary.

Let A and B be two rings, let J be an ideal of B and let $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism. In this setting, we can consider the following subring of $A \times B$:

$$A \bowtie^f J = \{(a, f(a) + j) / a \in A, j \in J\}$$

called the amalgamation of A with B along J with respect to f (introduced and studied by D'Anna, Finocchiaro, and Fontana in [9, 10]). This construction is a generalization of the amalgamated duplication of a ring along an ideal (introduced and studied by D'Anna and Fontana in [11, 12, 13] and denoted by $A \bowtie I$). Moreover, other classical constructions (such as the $A + XB[X]$, $A + XB[[X]]$, and the $D + M$ constructions) can be studied as particular cases of the amalgamation [9, Examples 2.5 & 2.6] and other classical constructions, such as the Nagata's idealization and the CPI extensions (in the sense of Boisen and Sheldon [4]) are strictly related to it (see [9, Example 2.7 & Remark 2.8]).

Let R be a commutative ring. For a nonnegative integer n, an R-module E is called n-presented if there is an exact sequence of R-modules:

$$F_n \to F_{n-1} \to \dots F_1 \to F_0 \to E \to 0$$

where each F_i is a finitely generated free R-module. In particular, 0-presented and 1-presented R-modules are, respectively, finitely generated and finitely presented R-modules.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13D05, 13D02.

Key words and phrases. Amalgamated algebra, amalgamated duplication, strong n-coherent ring, n-coherent ring, (n, d)-ring, n-finitely presented module.

The ring R is n-coherent if each $(n-1)$-presented ideal of R is n-presented, and R is strong n-coherent ring if each n-presented R-module is $(n+1)$-presented [14, 15] (This terminology is not the same as that of Costa (1994) [7], where Costa's n-coherence is our strong n-coherence). In particular, 1-coherence coincides with coherence, and one may view 0-coherence as Noetherianity. Any strong n-coherent ring is n-coherent, and the converse holds for $n = 1$ or for coherent rings [15, Proposition 3.3].

In 1994, Costa [7] introduced a doubly filtered set of classes of rings in order to categorize the structure of non-Noetherian rings: for non-negative integers n and d, we say that a ring R is an (n, d)-ring if $pd_R(E) \leq d$ for each n-presented R-module E (as usual, $pd_R(E)$ denotes the projective dimension of E as an R-module). An integral domain with this property will be called an (n, d)-domain. For example, the $(n, 0)$-domains are the fields, the $(0, 1)$-domains are the Dedekind domains, and the $(1, 1))$-domains are the Prüfer domains [7]. Every (n, d)-ring is strong $(sup\{n, d\})$-coherent and every (n, d)-domain is strong $(sup\{n, d-1\})$-coherent [7, Theorem 2.2].

We call a commutative ring an n-Von Neumann regular ring if it is an $(n, 0)$-ring. Thus, the 1-Von Neumann regular rings are the Von Neumann regular rings [7, Theorem 1.3].

In [7], Costa asks whether there is an (n, d)-ring which is neither an $(n, d-1)$-ring nor an $(n-1, d)$-ring for each integers $n, d \geq 0$. The answer is affirmative for $(0, d)$-ring and $(1, d)$-ring for each integer $d \geq 0$ ([7]).

Again in [7], Costa gives examples of $(2, 1)$-domains which are neither $(2, 0)$-domains (fields) nor $(1, 1)$-domains (Prüfer), and in [8], Costa and Kabbaj give examples of $(2, 2)$-domains which are neither $(2, 1)$-domains nor $(1, 2)$-domains. Later, in [21, 23], the author gives a class of $(2, d)$-domains which are neither $(2, d-1)$-domains nor $(1, d)$-domains for each integer $d \geq 1$, and a class of $(2, d)$-rings (not domains) which are neither $(2, d-1)$-rings (for $d \geq 1$) nor $(1, d)$-rings for each integer $d \geq 0$. Next, in [19], the authors construct a class of $(3, d)$-rings which are neither $(3, d-1)$-rings (for $d \geq 1$) nor $(2, d)$-rings for each integer $d \geq 0$. Finally, in [22], the author gives a sufficient condition to resolve Costa's first conjecture for each positive integer n and d with $n \geq 4$. The second main goal of this paper is the constructions of the second class of $(3, d)$-rings for each integer $d \geq 0$, and $(2, d)$-rings for $d \leq 2$, after the first class of cost's conjecture given by the authors in [19, 21, 23].

Let A be a ring, E be an A-module, and $R := A \propto E$ be the set of pairs (a, e) with pairwise addition and multiplication given by $(a, e)(b, f) = (ab, af + be)$. R is called the trivial ring extension of A by E (also called the idealization of E over A). Considerable work, part of it summarized in Glaz [17] and Huckaba [18], has been concerned with trivial ring extensions. These have proven to be useful in solving many open problems and conjectures for various contexts in (commutative and noncommutative) ring theory. See for instance [2, 3, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24].

The first section of this work examines the transfer of the properties of n-coherence and strong n-coherence to the amalgamated algebra $A \bowtie^f J$. Thereby, new examples are provided which, particularly, enriches the current literature with new classes of n-coherent rings ($n \geq 2$) that are non-coherent rings.

2. Transfer of the properties of (strong) n-coherence ($n \geq 1$)

The first main result of this section (Theorem 2.2) examines the transfer of the properties of strong n-coherence and n-coherence ($n \geq 1$) to the amalgamation algebra along an ideal $A \bowtie^f J$ issued from local rings.

First, it is worthwhile recalling that the function $f^n : A^n \to B^n$ defined by $f^n((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{i=n}) = (f(\alpha_i))_{i=1}^{i=n}$ is a ring homomorphism, $(A \bowtie^f J)^n \cong A^n \bowtie^{f^n} J^n$ and $f^n(\alpha a) = f(\alpha) f^n(a)$ for all $\alpha \in A$ and $a \in A^n$ (see [1]).

Next, before we announce the main result of this section (Theorem 2.2), we make the following useful remark.

Remark 2.1. *Let (A, M) be a local ring, $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let J be a proper ideal of B such that $J^2 = 0$. Then $A \bowtie^f J$ is a local ring and $M \bowtie^f J$ is its maximal ideal.*

Indeed, by [10, Proposition 2.6 (5)], $Max(A \bowtie^f J) = \{m \bowtie^f J / m \in Max(A)\} \cup \{\overline{Q}\}$ with $Q \in Max(B)$ not containing $V(J)$ and $\overline{Q} := \{(a, f(a) + j) / a \in A, j \in J, f(a) + j \in Q\}$. Since $J^2 = 0$, then $J \subseteq Rad(B)$, and then $J \subseteq Q$ for all $Q \in Max(B)$. So, $Max(A \bowtie^f J) = \{m \bowtie^f J / m \in Max(A)\} = M \bowtie^f J$ since (A, M) is a local ring. Therefore $(A \bowtie^f J, M \bowtie^f J)$ is a local ring, as desired.

□

Theorem 2.2. *Let (A, M) be a local ring, $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let J be a proper ideal of B such that J is a finitely generated ideal of $(f(A) + J)$, $J^2 = 0$ and $f(M)J = 0$. Then:*

(1) $A \bowtie^f J$ is strong n-coherent ring if and only if so is A.
(2) $A \bowtie^f J$ is n-coherent ring if and only if so is A.

The proof of Theorem 2.2 draws on the following results.

Lemma 2.3. *Let (A, M) be a local ring, $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let J be a proper ideal of B such that $J^2 = 0$ and $f(M)J = 0$. Let $p, n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let U be a sub-module of M^p. Then $U \bowtie^{f^p} J^p$ is a n-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module if and only if U is a n-finitely presented A-module, and J is a finitely generated ideal of $f(A) + J$.*

Proof. Proceed by induction on n. The property is true for $n = 0$. Indeed, by [1, Lemma 2.4], it remains to show that if $U \bowtie^{f^p} J^p := \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(A \bowtie^f J)(u_i, f^p(u_i) + k_i)$ is a finitely generated ideal of $A \bowtie^f J$, where, $u_i \in U$ and $k_i \in J^p$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$, then J is a finitely generated ideal of $(f(A) + J)$. Clearly, $\sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(f(A) + J)k_i \subseteq J^p$. Let $k \in J^p$. Then, $(0, k) = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i) + j_i)(u_i, f^p(u_i) + k_i)$ for some $\alpha_i \in A$ and $j_i \in J$. So $\sum_{i=1}^{i=r} \alpha_i u_i = 0$, and $k = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(f(\alpha_i)+j_i)(f^p(u_i)+k_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(f(\alpha_i)+j_i)k_i \in \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(f(A)+J)k_i$ (since $f^p(U)J \subseteq f^p(M^p)J = 0$). Thus $J^p \subseteq \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(f(A)+J)k_i$. Therefore, $J^p = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(f(A) + J)k_i$, and then J is a finitely generated ideal of $f(A) + J$. Assume that the property is true for n, and assume that $U \bowtie^{f^p} J^p = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} A \bowtie^f J(u_i, f^p(u_i) + k_i)$ is a $(n + 1)$-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module, where $u_i \in U$ and $k_i \in J^p$ for all $i \in \{1, ...r\}$. Clearly, $U = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} Au_i$. We may assume that $\{(u_i, f^p(u_i) + k_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}\}$ is a minimal generating set of $U \bowtie^{f^p} J^p$. Consider the exact sequence of A-modules:

$$0 \to Kerv \to A^r \to U \to 0 \qquad (1)$$

where $v((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} \alpha_i u_i$. On the other hand consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules:

$$0 \to Keru \to (A \bowtie^f J)^r \to U \bowtie^{f^p} J^p \to 0 \qquad (2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} u((\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i) + j_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i) + j_i)(u_i, f^p(u_i) + k_i) \\ &= (\sum_{i=1}^{i=r} \alpha_i u_i, \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} f(\alpha_i)(f^p(u_i) + k_i)). \end{aligned}$$

Then $Keru = \{(\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i)+j_i)_{i=1}^{i=r} \in (A \bowtie^f J)^r / \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} \alpha_i u_i = 0, \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} f(\alpha_i)(f^p(u_i)+ k_i) = 0\}$.
So, $Keru = \{((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}, f^r((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}) + (j_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}) \in A^r \bowtie^{f^r} J^r / \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} \alpha_i u_i = 0, \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} f(\alpha_i)k_i = 0\}$. Since $A \bowtie^f J$ is a local ring by Remark 2.1 and $\{(u_i, f^p(u_i) + k_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}\}$ is a minimal generating set of $U \bowtie^{f^p} J^p$, then $Keru \subseteq M^r \bowtie^{f^r} J^r$. So, $Keru = \{((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}, f^r((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{i=r})+(j_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}) \in A^r \bowtie^{f^r} J^r / (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{i=r} \in Kerv\}$. Therefore $Keru = Kerv \bowtie^{f^r} J^r$.
Since $U \bowtie^{f^p} J^p$ is a $(n+1)$-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module, then $Keru$ is a n-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module (by a sequence (2)). So, $Kerv$ is a n-finitely presented A-module and J is a finitely generated ideal of $(f(A) + J)$ by induction (since $Kerv \subseteq M^r$). Thus, U is a $(n + 1)$-finitely presented A-module (by a sequence (1)). Conversely, assume that U is a

$(n+1)$-finitely presented A-module and J is a finitely generated ideal of $(f(A)+J)$, then $U \bowtie^{f^p} J^p$ is a finitely generated $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module by induction, and then $U \bowtie^{f^p} J^p = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} A \bowtie^f J(u_i, f^p(u_i)+k_i)$, where $u_i \in U$ and $k_i \in J^p$ for all $i \in \{1, ...r\}$. It is obvious that $U = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} Au_i$. Since U is a $(n+1)$-finitely presented A-module, then $Kerv$ is a n-finitely presented A-module (by a sequence (1)). So, $Keru(= Kerv \bowtie^{f^r} J^r)$ is a n-finitely generated $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module by induction, and then $U \bowtie^{f^p} J^p$ is a $(n+1)$-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module (by a sequence (2)), as desired.

□

Lemma 2.4. *Let (A, M) be a local ring, $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let J be a proper ideal of B such that $J^2 = 0$ and $f(M)J = 0$. Let $p, n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $W := \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(A \bowtie^f J)(u_i, f^p(u_i)+k_i)$ where, $u_i \in M^p$, $k_i \in J^p$, and let $U = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} Au_i$. Then W is a n-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module if and only if U is a n-finitely presented A-module and J is a finitely generated ideal of $f(A)+J$.*

Proof. Let $W := \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(A \bowtie^f J)(u_i, f^p(u_i)+k_i)$ and $U = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} Au_i$. We may assume that $\{(u_i, f^p(u_i)+k_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}\}$ is a minimal generating set of W. Consider the exact sequence of A-modules:

$$0 \to Kerv \to A^r \to U \to 0 \qquad (1)$$

where $v((\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} \alpha_i u_i$. On the other hand consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules:

$$0 \to Keru \to (A \bowtie^f J)^r \to W \to 0 \qquad (2)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} u((\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i)+j_i)_{i=1}^{i=r}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i)+j_i)(u_i, f^p(u_i)+k_i) \\ &= (\sum_{i=1}^{i=r}\alpha_i u_i, \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} f(\alpha_i)(f^p(u_i)+k_i)) \end{aligned}$$

Then $Keru = \{(\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i)+j_i)_{i=1}^{i=r} \in (A \bowtie^f J)^p / \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}\alpha_i u_i = 0, \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} f(\alpha_i)k_i = 0\}$. Since $Keru \subseteq M^r \bowtie^{f^r} J^r$, then $Keru = Kerv \bowtie^{f^r} J^r$.
By Lemma 2.3, $Keru$ is a n-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module if and only if $Kerv$ is a n-finitely presented A-module and J is a finitely generated ideal of $f(A)+J$ (since $Kerv \subseteq M^r$). So, W is a $(n+1)$-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module if and only if U is a $(n+1)$-finitely presented A-module and J is a finitely generated ideal of $f(A)+J$, as desired.

□

Proof of Theorem 2.2.

(1) Recall that R is a strong n-coherent ring if and only if every $(n-1)$-presented submodule of a finitely generated free R-module is n-presented. Assume that $A \bowtie^f J$ is strong n-coherent ring and let $U := \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} Au_i$ be a

$(n-1)$-finitely presented A-module, where $u_i \in M^p$, then $W : \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(A \bowtie^f J)(u_i, f^p(u_i))$ is a $(n-1)$-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module by Lemma 2.4. So, W is n-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module since $A \bowtie^f J$ is strong n-coherent ring. Therefore U is n-finitely presented A-module by Lemma 2.4. Thus, A is strong n-coherent ring. Conversely, assume that A is strong n-coherent ring and let $W := \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} A \bowtie^f J(u_i, f^p(u_i) + k_i)$ be a $(n-1)$-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module, where $u_i \in M^p$, and $k_i \in J^p$. Then $U := \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} Au_i$ is a $(n-1)$-finitely presented A-module by Lemma 2.4. So, U is n-finitely presented A-module since A is strong n-coherent ring, and then W is a n-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module by Lemma 2.4. Hence, $A \bowtie^f J$ is strong n-coherent ring.

(2) The same reasoning as in the proof of (1) shows that $A \bowtie^f J$ is n-coherent ring if and only if so is A.

□

The following corollaries are an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.2.

Corollary 2.5. *Let (A, M) be a local ring, $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let J be a proper ideal of B such that J is a finitely generated ideal of $(f(A) + J)$, $J^2 = 0$ and $f(M)J = 0$. Then, $A \bowtie^f J$ is a (strong) n-coherent ring which is non-(strong) $(n-1)$-coherent if and only if so is A.*

Corollary 2.6. *Let (A, M) be a local ring and I be a finitely generated ideal of A such that $MI = 0$. Then:*

(1) $A \bowtie I$ is a strong n-coherent ring if and only if so is A.
(2) $A \bowtie I$ is a n-coherent ring if and only if so is A.

In particular, Theorem 2.2 enriches the literature with new examples of 2-coherent rings which are non-coherent rings.

Example 2.7. *Let k be a field, K be a field containing k as a subfield such that $[K : k] = \infty$, $T = K[[X]] = K + M$, where X is an indeterminate over K and $M = XT$ be the maximal ideal of T, $A = k + M$.*
Set $B := A/M^2$, $J := Bf(m)$ be an ideal of B, where $m \in M$ such that $f(m) \neq 0$, and consider the canonical ring homomorphism $f : A \to B$ $(f(x) = \overline{x})$. Then:

(1) By Theorem 2.2, $A \bowtie^f J$ is 2-coherent ring since A is by [7, Corollary 5.2].
(2) By [17, Theorem 4.1.5], *$A \bowtie^f J$ is non-coherent ring since A is non-coherent domain by* [7, Corollary 5.2].

Example 2.8. *Let K be a field and E be a K-vector space of infinite dimension. Let $A := K \propto E$ be trivial extension ring of K by E. Set $I := 0 \propto E'$, where E' is a finitely generated K-subspace of E. Then:*

(1) By Corollary 2.6, $A \bowtie I$ is a 2-coherent ring since A is by [21, Theorem 3.4].

(2) By [17, Theorem 4.1.5] *$A \bowtie I$ is non-coherent ring since A is non-coherent ring by* [20, Theorem 2.6].

3. Transfer of the (n, d)-property

For integers $n, d \geq 0$, Costa asks in [7] whether there is an (n, d)-ring which is neither an $(n, d-1)$-ring nor an $(n-1, d)$-ring? The answer is affirmative for $(0, d)$-rings, $(1, d)$-rings, $(2, d)$-rings, $(3, d)$-rings, and $(n+4, d)$-rings for all integers n, d (See for instance [7, 8, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 22]). The goal of This section is to give a second class of cost's conjecture after the first given by the authors in [19, 21, 23]. At the end of this work, we will be able to give examples of $(2, d)$-rings which is neither a $(1, d)$-ring $(d = 0, 1, 2)$ nor a $(2, d-1)$-ring $(d = 1, 2)$, and examples of $(3, d)$-rings which is neither a $(2, d)$-ring $(d \geq 0)$ nor a $(3, d-1)$-ring (for each integer d).
The following Theorem 3.1 allows us to provide new examples of $(2, 0)$, $(2, 1)$, and $(2, 2)$-ring, to resolve cost's conjecture.

Theorem 3.1. *Let (A, M) be a local ring, $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let J be a proper ideal of B such that $f(M)J = 0$ and $J^2 = 0$. Then:*

(1) (a) $A \bowtie^f J$ is a $(2, 0)$-ring provided J is a not finitely generated ideal of $f(A) + J$.

(b) If $A \bowtie^f J$ is a $(2, 0)$-ring, then M is not a finitely generated ideal of A or J is not a finitely generated ideal of $f(A) + J$.

(c) Assume that M is a finitely generated ideal of A. Then $A \bowtie^f J$ is a $(2, 0)$-ring if and only if J is a not finitely generated ideal of $f(A) + J$.

(2) $A \bowtie^f J$ is a non-$(1, 2)$-ring. In particular, $A \bowtie^f J$ is a non-von Neumann regular ring.

Proof of Theorem 3.1

(1) (a) Let K be a 2-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module, and let $\{(k_i)_{i=1}^{i=p}\}$ be a minimal generating set of K. We want to show that K is a projective $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module. For this, consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules:

$$0 \to Keru(= H) \to (A \bowtie^f J)^p \to K \to 0$$

where $u((\alpha_i)_{i=1,.....,p}) = \sum_{i=1}^{i=p} \alpha_i k_i$. Then $H \subset (M \bowtie^f J)^p$ since $\{(k_i)_{i=1}^{i=p}\}$ is a minimal generating set of K, $A \bowtie^f J$ is a local ring with maximal ideal $M \bowtie^f J$ by Remark 2.1. We prove that $H = 0$. Otherwise, $H \neq 0$. Let $(m_i, f^p(m_i) + k_i)_{\{i=1,...,r\}}$ be a minimal generating set of H, where $m_i \in M^p, k_i \in J^p$ for each $i = 1, ..., r$. Consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules

$$0 \to Kerv \to (A \bowtie^f J)^r \to H \to 0$$

where $v((\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i) + j_i)_{i=1,.....,r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(\alpha_i m_i, (f(\alpha_i) + j_i)(f^p(m_i) + k_i)) = (\sum_{i=1}^{i=r} \alpha_i m_i, \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} f(\alpha_i)(f^p(m_i) + k_i))$. But $Kerv \subset (M \bowtie^f J)^r$. Hence $Kerv = U \bowtie^{f^r} J^r$. Where $U = \{(\alpha_i)_{i=1,...,r} \in A^r / \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} \alpha_i m_i = 0\}$. Since K is a 2-presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module, then $Kerv$ is a finitely generated $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module. So, J is a finitely generated ideal of $(f(A) + J)$ by Lemma 2.3 (since $U \subseteq M^r$). A contradiction since J is a not finitely generated ideal of $f(A) + J$ by hypothesis. So $H = 0$. Hence, $K \cong (A \bowtie^f J)^p$ is a projective $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module.

(b) Let $k(\neq 0) \in J$, $I = (A \bowtie^f J)(0, k)$, and consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules:

$$0 \to Keru \to A \bowtie^f J \to I \to 0$$

where $u(\alpha, f(\alpha) + j) = (0, f(\alpha)k)$. So, $Keru = M \bowtie^f J$ is a not finitely generated ideal of $A \bowtie^f J$ since $A \bowtie^f J$ is a $(2, 0)$-ring, and I is not projective ideal of $A \bowtie^f J$ (otherwise, I is a free ideal of $A \bowtie^f J$ since $A \bowtie^f J$ is a local ring, absurd since $(0, k)I = 0$). Therefore, M is a not finitely generated ideal of A or J is a not finitely generated ideal of $f(A)+J$ by Lemma 2.3.

(c) Follows immediately from (a) an (b).

(2) Let $I = (A \bowtie^f J)(0, k)$, where $k(\neq 0) \in J$, and consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules:

$$0 \to M \bowtie^f J \to A \bowtie^f J \to I \to 0$$

Since $A \bowtie^f J$ is a local ring and $M \bowtie^f J$ is not a free ideal of $A \bowtie^f J$ (since $(0, k)(M \bowtie^f J) = 0$), then $M \bowtie^f J$ is not a projective ideal of $A \bowtie^f J$. So, $pd_{A \bowtie^f J}(\frac{A \bowtie^f J}{I}) > 2$ (i.e. $A \bowtie^f J$ is a not a $(1, 2)$-ring), and this completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

□

The next corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 3.2. *Let (A, M) be a local ring, $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let J be a proper ideal of B such that $f(M)J = 0$ and $J^2 = 0$. Let $A_1 = A \bowtie^f J$, $d \leq 2$ be an integer, A_2 be a Noetherian ring of global dimension d, and let $C = A_1 \times A_2$ the direct product of A_1 and A_2.*
Assume that J is a not finitely generated ideal of $f(A) + J$. Then C is a

$(2,d)$-ring which is neither a $(1,d)$-ring $(d=0,1,2)$ nor a $(2,d-1)$-ring $(d=1,2)$.

Proof. Let $d \leq 2$ be an integer. By [21, Theorem 2.4], $C = A_1 \times A_2$ is a $(2,d)$-ring since A_i is a $(2,d)$-ring for each $i = 1,2$, and C is not $(1,d)$-ring since A_1 is not $(1,d)$-ring by Theorem 3.1 (2). It remains to show that C is not a $(2,d-1)$-ring for $1 \leq d \leq 2$. Assume that C is a $(2,d-1)$-ring. By [21, theorem 2.4], A_2 is also a $(2,d-1)$-ring and then is a $(0,d-1)$-ring by [7, Theorem 2.4] since A_2 is a Noetherian ring. Thus, $gldim(A_2) \leq d-1$, but this is a contradiction since $gldim(A_2) = d$, as desired.

□

Now, we are able to give a new examples of $(2,0)$, $(2,1)$, and $(2,2)$-ring, to resolve cost's conjecture.

Example 3.3. *Let (R,m) be a local ring such that m is a finitely generated ideal of R and $m^2 = 0$ (for instance $((R,m) = (\frac{\mathbb{Z}}{4\mathbb{Z}}, \frac{2\mathbb{Z}}{4\mathbb{Z}})$), E be an $\frac{R}{m}$-vector space with finite rank, and let $A := R \propto E$ and $M := m \propto E$. Let E' be a $\frac{A}{M}$-vector space of infinite dimension, $B := A \propto E'$, $J := 0 \propto E'$, and consider the ring homomorphism $f : A \to B$ $(f(a) = (a,0))$. Let K be a field, $A_1 = A \bowtie^f J$, and let $A_2 := K[X_1]$ and $A_3 := K[X_1, X_2]$ where X_1, X_2 are indeterminate over K. Then, by Corollary 3.2:*

(1) A_1 is a $(2,0)$ ring that is not a $(1,0)$-ring.
(2) $A_1 \times A_2$ is a $(2,1)$-ring which is neither a $(1,1)$-ring nor a $(2,0)$-ring.
(3) $A_1 \times A_3$ is a $(2,2)$-ring which is neither a $(1,2)$-ring nor a $(2,1)$-ring.

The aim of Theorem 3.4 is to construct a class of $(3,d)$-rings which are neither $(3,d-1)$-rings (for each positive integer d) nor $(2,d)$-rings for each integer $d \geq 0$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let (A,M) be a local ring, $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let J be a proper ideal of B such that $f(M)J = 0$ and $J^2 = 0$.*

(1) $A \bowtie^f J$ is a $(3,0)$-ring provided M is not a finitely generated ideal of A.
(2) Assume that J is a finitely generated ideal of $f(A) + J$ and M contains a regular element. Then:
  (a) $A \bowtie^f J$ is not a $(2,d)$-ring for each positive integer d.
  (b) Let $A_1 = A \bowtie^f J$, d be an integer, A_2 be a Noetherian ring of global dimension d, and let $C = A_1 \times A_2$ the direct product of A_1 and A_2. Assume that M is not finitely generated ideal of A. Then C is a $(3,d)$-ring which is neither a $(2,d)$-ring $(d \geq 0)$ nor a $(3,d-1)$-ring $(d \geq 1)$.

The proof of this theorem requires the next result.

Lemma 3.5. *Let (A, M) be a local ring, $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let J be a proper ideal of B such that J is a finitely generated ideal of $f(A) + J$, $f(M)J = 0$ and $J^2 = 0$. Then $pd_{A\bowtie^f J}(M \bowtie^f J)$ and $pd_{A\bowtie^f J}(\{0\} \times J)$ are infinite.*

Proof. Consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules

$$0 \to M \bowtie^f J \to A \bowtie^f J \to \tfrac{A\bowtie^f J}{M\bowtie^f J} \to 0$$

We claim that $\frac{A\bowtie^f J}{M\bowtie^f J}$ is not projective. Otherwise, the sequence splits. Hence, $M \bowtie^f J$ is generated by an idempotent element $(m, f(m) + k) = (m, f(m)+k)(m, f(m)+k) = (m^2, f(m^2))$. So $M \bowtie^f J = (A \bowtie^f J)(m, f(m)) = Am \bowtie^f 0$, the desired contradiction (since $J \neq 0$). It follows from the above sequence that

$$pd_{A\bowtie^f J}(M \bowtie^f J) + 1 = pd_{A\bowtie^f J}(\tfrac{A\bowtie^f J}{M\bowtie^f J}) \qquad (1)$$

Let $\{(m_i)_{i\in I}\}$ be a set of generators of M, where $m_i \in M$ for all $i \in I$, and let $\{(g_i)_{i=1}^{i=p}\}$ be a minimal generating set of J. Consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules

$$0 \to Keru \to (A \bowtie^f J)^I \bigoplus (A \bowtie^f J)^p \to M \bowtie^f J \to 0$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} u((\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i) + j_i)_{i\in I}, (\beta_i, f(\beta_i) + k_i)_{i=1}^{i=p}) &= \sum_{i\in I}(\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i) + j_i)(m_i, f(m_i)) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{i=p}(\beta_i, f(\beta_i) + k_i)(0, g_i) \\ &= \sum_{i\in I}(\alpha_i m_i, f(\alpha_i m_i)) + \sum_{i=1}^{i=p}(0, f(\beta_i)g_i) \end{aligned}$$

$Keru = U \bowtie^{f^I} J^I \bigoplus (M \bowtie^f J)^p$. Where $U = \{(\alpha_i)_{i\in I} \in A^I / \sum_{i\in I} \alpha_i m_i = 0\}$ (since $\{(g_i)_{i=1}^{i=p}\}$ be a minimal generating set of J). Therefore, we have the isomorphism of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules

$$M \bowtie^f J \cong \tfrac{(A\bowtie^f J)^I}{U\bowtie^{f^I} J^I} \bigoplus \tfrac{(A\bowtie^f J)^p}{(M\bowtie^f J)^p}$$

It follows that

$$pd_{A\bowtie^f J}(\tfrac{A\bowtie^f J}{M\bowtie^f J}) \leq pd_{A\bowtie^f J}(M \bowtie^f J) \qquad (2)$$

Clearly, (1) and (2) force $pd_{A\bowtie^f J}(M \bowtie^f J)$ to be infinite. Now the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules

$$0 \to M \bowtie^f J \to A \bowtie^f J \to \{0\} \times J \to 0$$

where $v(\alpha, f(\alpha)+j) = (\alpha, f(\alpha)+j)(0, k) = (0, f(\alpha)k)$, easily yields $pd_{A\bowtie^f J}(\{0\}\times J) = \infty$, as desired.

□

Proof of Theorem 3.4

(1) Let K_3 be a 3-finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module, and let $\{(k_i)_{i=1}^{i=p}\}$ be a minimal generating set of K_3. We want to show that K_3 is a projective $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module. For this, consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules:

$$0 \to Keru(= K_2) \to (A \bowtie^f J)^p \to K_3 \to 0$$

where $u((\alpha_i)_{i=1,.....,p}) = \sum_{i=1}^{i=p} \alpha_i k_i$. Then $K_2 \subset (M \bowtie^f J)^p$ since $\{(k_i)_{i=1}^{i=p}\}$ is a minimal generating set of K_3, $A \bowtie^f J$ is a local ring with maximal ideal $M \bowtie^f J$. We prove that $K_2 = 0$. Otherwise, $K_2 \neq 0$. Let $(m_i, f^p(m_i) + k_i)_{\{i=1,...,r\}}$ be a minimal generating set of K_2, where $m_i \in M^p, k_i \in J^p$ for each $i = 1, ..., r$. Consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules

$$0 \to Kerv(= K_1) \to (A \bowtie^f J)^r \to K_2 \to 0$$

where $v((\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i) + j_i)_{i=1,.....,r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r}(\alpha_i m_i, (f(\alpha_i) + j_i)(f^p(m_i) + k_i)) = (\sum_{i=1}^{i=r} \alpha_i m_i, \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} f(\alpha_i)(f^p(m_i) + k_i))$. But $K_1 \subset (M \bowtie^f J)^r$. Hence $K_1 = U \bowtie^{f^r} J^r$. Where $U = \{(\alpha_i)_{i=1,...,r} \in A^r / \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} \alpha_i m_i = 0\}$. Since K_3 is a 3-presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module, then K_1 is a finitely presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module. By Lemma 2.3, U is a finitely generated A-module and J is a finitely generated ideal of $f(A) + J$. Let $\{(u_i)_{i=1}^{i=s}\}$ be a set of generators of U, and let $\{(g_i)_{i=s+1}^{i=s+t}\}$ be a minimal generating set of J^r, where $u_i \in M^r, g_i \in J^r$. Consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules

$$0 \to Kerw(= K_0) \to (A \bowtie^f J)^{s+t} \to K_1 \to 0$$

where $w((\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i)+j_i)_{i=1,.....,s+t}) = \sum_{i=1}^{i=s}(\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i)+j_i)(u_i, f^r(u_i))+\sum_{i=s+1}^{i=s+t}(\alpha_i, f(\alpha_i)+ j_i)(0, g_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{i=s}(\alpha_i u_i, f^r(\alpha_i u_i))+\sum_{i=s+1}^{i=s+t}(0, f(\alpha_i)g_i)) = (\sum_{i=1}^{i=s} \alpha_i u_i, \sum_{i=1}^{i=s} f^r(\alpha_i u_i)+ \sum_{i=s+1}^{i=s+t} f(\alpha_i)g_i)$. It follows that $K_0 \cong W \bowtie^{f^s} J^s \bigoplus M^t \bowtie^{f^t} J^t$, where $W = \{(\alpha_i)_{i=1,...,s} \in A^s / \sum_{i=1}^{i=s} \alpha_i u_i = 0\}$ (since $\{(g_i)_{i=s+1}^{i=s+t}\}$ is a minimal generating set of J^r). By the above sequence K_0 is a finitely generated $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module. So M is a finitely generated ideal of A, the desired contradiction.

(2) (a) Assume that M contains a regular element m and J is a finitely generated ideal of $(f(A) + J)$. We must show that $A \bowtie^f J$ is not a $(2, d)$-ring, for each integer $d \geqslant 0$. Let $K = (A \bowtie^f J)(m, f(m))$ and consider the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules

$$0 \to Kerv \to A \bowtie^f J \to K \to 0 \qquad (*)$$

where $v(\alpha, f(\alpha) + j) = (\alpha, f(\alpha) + j)(m, f(m)) = (\alpha m, f(\alpha m))$. Clearly $Kerv = \{0\} \times J$ that is a finitely generated ideal of $(A \bowtie^f J)$ and hence K is a finitely presented ideal of $(A \bowtie^f J)$ by a sequence $(*)$. On the other hand, $pd_{A \bowtie^f J}(Ker(v)) = pd_{A \bowtie^f J}(\{0\} \times J) = \infty$ by Lemma 3.5. So $pd_{A \bowtie^f J}(K) = \infty$. Finally, the exact sequence of $(A \bowtie^f J)$-modules

$$0 \to K \to A \bowtie^f J \to \frac{A \bowtie^f J}{K} \to 0$$

yields $\frac{A\bowtie^f J}{K}$ a 2-presented $(A \bowtie^f J)$-module with infinite projective dimension (i.e., $A \bowtie^f J$ is not a $(2,d)$-ring, for each $d \geqslant 0$).

(b) The same reasoning as in the proof of Corollary 3.2 shows that C is a $(3,d)$-ring which is neither a $(2,d)$-ring $(d \geq 0)$ nor a $(3,d-1)$-ring $(d \geq 1)$, and this completes the proof of Theorem 3.4.

□

The following Corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.4.

Corollary 3.6. *Let (A,M) be a local domain such that M is not finitely generated ideal of A, $f : A \to B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let J be a proper ideal of B such that J is a finitely generated ideal of $f(A)+J$, $f(M)J = 0$ and $J^2 = 0$. Then:*

(1) $A \bowtie^f J$ is a $(3,0)$-ring which is not a $(2,0)$-ring.
(2) Let $A_1 = A \bowtie^f J$, d be an integer, A_2 be a Noetherian ring of global dimension d, and let $C = A_1 \times A_2$ the direct product of A_1 and A_2. The ring C is a $(3,d)$-ring which is neither a $(2,d)$-ring nor a $(3,d-1)$-ring.

Theorem 3.4 enriches the literature with new examples of $(3,d)$-rings which are neither a $(2,d)$-ring $(d \geq 0)$ nor a $(3,d-1)$-ring $(d \geq 1)$, as shown below.

Example 3.7. *Let k be any field and $X_1, X_2, ..., X_n, ...$ be indeterminate over K. Let $A = K[[X_1, X_2, .., X_n, ..]]$ the power series ring in infinite variables over K, and Let M be its maximal ideal. Set $B := A/M^2$, $J := Bf(m)$ be an ideal of B, where $m \in M$ such that $f(m) \neq 0$, and consider the canonical ring homomorphism $f : A \to B$ $(f(x) = \overline{x})$. Let $C = \mathbb{Z}[X_1, X_2, ..., X_{d-1}]$, where $d \geq 1$. Then by Corollary 3.6, $(A \bowtie^f J) \times C$ is a $(3,d)$-ring which is neither a $(2,d)$-ring nor a $(3,d-1)$-ring.*

Example 3.8. *Let k be a field and let $A = K[[X]] = K + M$, where $M = XA$. Set $B := A/M^2$, $J := Bf(m)$ be an ideal of B, where $m \in M$ such that $f(m) \neq 0$, and consider the canonical ring homomorphism $f : A \to B$ $(f(x) = \overline{x})$. Then $A \bowtie^f J$ is not an (n,d)-ring, for any integers $n, d \geq 0$.*

Proof. $A \bowtie^f J$ is Noetherian ring since A is by [9, Proposition 5.6] and by Lemma 3.5, $pd_{A\bowtie^f J}(\{0\} \times J) = \infty$, whence $gldim(A \bowtie^f J) = \infty$. Then by [7, Theorem 1.3], $A \bowtie^f J$ is not an (n,d)-ring, for any integers $n, d \geq 0$, as desired.

□

References

1. K. Alaoui and N. Mahdou, *Coherence in amalgamated algebra along an ideal*, Bulletin of the Iranian Mathematical Society, Accepted for publication. See: arXiv: submit/0631069 [math.AC] 12 Jan 2013.
2. C. Bakkari, S. Kabbaj and N. Mahdou, *Trivial extention defined by Prüfer conditions*, J. Pure. Appl. Algebra 214 (2010), 53-60.
3. S. Bazzoni and S. Glaz, *Gaussian properties of total rings of quotients*, J. Algebra 310 (2007), 180-193.
4. M. B. Boisen and P. B. Sheldon, *CPI-extension: Over rings of integral domains with special prime spectrum*, Canad. J. Math. 29 (1977), 722-737.
5. N. Bourbaki, *Algèbre Commutative*, chapitres 1-4, Masson: Paris, 1985.
6. W. Brewer and E. Rutter, *$D + M$ constructions with general overrings*, Michigan Math. J. 23 (1976), 33–42.
7. D. Costa, *Parameterizing families of non-Noetherian rings*, Comm. Algebra 22 (1994), 3997–4011.
8. D. Costa and S. Kabbaj, *Classes of D+M rings defined by homological conditions*, Comm. Algebra (1996), 24, 8917906.
9. M. D'Anna, C. A. Finocchiaro and M. Fontana, *Amalgamated algebras along an ideal*, in: Commutative Algebra and Applications, Proceedings of the Fifth International Fez Conference on Commutative Algebra and Applications, Fez, Morocco, 2008, W. de Gruyter Publisher, Berlin (2009), 155–172.
10. M. D'Anna, C. A. Finocchiaro and M. Fontana, *Properties of chains of prime ideals in amalgamated algebras along an ideal*, J. Pure Applied Algebra 214 (2010), 1633-1641.
11. M. D'Anna, *A construction of Gorenstein rings*, J. Algebra 306 (2) (2006), 507-519.
12. M. D'Anna and M. Fontana, *Amalgamated duplication of a ring along a multiplicative-canonical ideal*, Ark. Mat. 45 (2) (2007), 241-252.
13. M. D'Anna and M. Fontana, *An amalgamated duplication of a ring along an ideal: the basic properties*, J. Algebra Appl. 6 (3) (2007), 443-459.
14. D. E. Dobbs, S. Kabbaj and N. Mahdou, *n-coherent rings and modules*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., Dekker, 185 (1997), 269–281.
15. D. E. Dobbs, S. Kabbaj, N. Mahdou and M. Sobrani, *When is $D + M$ n-coherent and an (n, d)-domain?*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., Dekker, 205 (1999), 257–270.
16. D. E. Dobbs and I. Papick, *When is $D + M$ coherent?*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 56 (1976), 51–54.
17. S. Glaz, *Commutative coherent rings*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1371, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
18. J. A. Huckaba, *Commutative rings with zero divisors*, Marcel Dekker, New York-Basel, 1988.
19. S. Kabbaj and N. Mahdou, *Trivial extensions of local rings and a conjecture of Costa*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., Dekker, 231 (2003), 301–311.
20. S. Kabbaj and N. Mahdou, *Trivial extensions defined by coherent-like conditions*, Comm. Algebra 32 (10) (2004), 3937–3953.
21. N. Mahdou, *On Costa's conjecture*, Comm. Algebra 29 (2001), 2775–2785.
22. N. Mahdou, *Sufficient Condition to Resolve Costa's First Conjecture*,.....
23. N. Mahdou, *On 2-Von Neumann regular rings*, Comm. Algebra 33 (10) (2005): 3489-3496.
24. I. Palmér and J. Roos, *Explicit formulae for the global homological dimensionsof trivial extensions of rings*, J. Algebra 27 (1973), 380-413.
25. D. Zhou, *On n-coherent rings and (n, d)-rings*. Comm. Algebra 32 (2004), 2425-2441.

Karima Alaoui Ismaili, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology of Fez, Box 2202, University S.M. Ben Abdellah Fez, Morocco.

$E-mail\ address:\ alaouikarima2012@hotmail.fr$

Najib Mahdou, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology of Fez, Box 2202, University S.M. Ben Abdellah Fez, Morocco.

$E-mail\ address:\ mahdou@hotmail.com$